

DYNAMICAL MASS OF TYPE 2 SEYFERT NUCLEI

SHINGO NISHIURA, AND YOSHIAKI TANIGUCHI

Astronomical Institute, Tohoku University, Aoba, Sendai, 980-77, Japan;

nishiura@astroa.astr.tohoku.ac.jp, tani@astroa.astr.tohoku.ac.jp

Received _____; accepted _____

ABSTRACT

We have derived the masses of central objects (M_{BH}) of nine type 2 Seyfert nuclei using the observational properties of the *hidden* broad $\text{H}\beta$ emission. We obtain the average dynamical mass, $\log(M_{\text{BH}}/M_{\odot}) \simeq 8.00 \pm 0.51 - 0.475 \log(\tau_{\text{es}}/1)$ where τ_{es} is the optical depth for electron scattering. If $\tau_{\text{es}} \sim 1$, this average mass is almost comparable with those of type 1 Seyfert nuclei. However, if $\tau_{\text{es}} \ll 1$, as is usually considered, the average mass of type 2 Seyfert nuclei may be more massive than that of type 1s. We discuss implications for issues concerning both the current unified model of Seyfert nuclei and physical conditions of the electron scattering regions.

Subject headings: black holes - galaxies: nuclei - galaxies: Seyfert

1. INTRODUCTION

It is generally considered that active galactic nuclei (AGNs) are powered by single, accreting supermassive black holes (e.g., Rees 1984; Blandford 1990). According to this scenario, the accretion rate onto a black hole is an important parameter to explain the huge luminosity of AGNs. However, since the luminosity released from this central engine is proportional to the mass of the black hole [ie., the Eddington luminosity, $L_{\text{Edd}} \sim 10^{46} (M_{\text{BH}}/10^8 M_{\odot}) \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ where M_{BH} is the black hole mass], the mass itself is considered as another important parameter (Blandford 1990). Relationships between mass and luminosity of AGNs provide important information about the nature of central engines (e.g., Wandel & Yahil 1985; Padovani & Rafanelli 1988; Padovani 1989; Koratkar & Gaskell 1991b). Further, the mass function of nuclei may place constraints on the formation and evolution of supermassive black holes in the universe (Padovani, Burg, & Edelson 1990; Haehnelt & Rees 1993). Therefore, the mass of AGNs is of fundamental importance in understanding the AGN phenomena.

In order to estimate the nuclear mass, the so-called dynamical method has been often used (Dibai 1981, 1984; Wandel & Yahil 1985; Wandel & Mushotzky 1986; Joly et al. 1985; Reshetnikov 1987; Padovani & Rafanelli 1988; Padovani, Burg, & Edelson 1990; Koratkar & Gaskell 1991b). If the gas motion in a broad emission-line region (BLR) is dominated by the gravitational force exerted by the central massive object, the line width can be used to estimate the mass of the central object given the radial distance of the BLR (Woltier 1959; Setti & Woltier 1966). Since the recent elaborate monitoring observations of AGNs have shown that the gas motion in the BLRs is almost dominated by the gravitation (Gaskell 1988; Koratkar & Gaskell 1991a, 1991c; Clavel et al. 1991; Peterson 1993; Robinson 1994; Korista et al. 1995; Wanders et al. 1995; Wanders & Peterson 1996), the basic assumption in the dynamical method is considered to be robust. In section 2, we discuss the method in detail.

All the previous estimates of nuclear mass have been made for type 1 Seyfert nuclei (hereafter S1s) and quasars because the dynamical method needs both the flux and the velocity width of broad line emission. This raises the question “How massive are type 2 Seyfert nuclei (hereafter

S2s) and are they similar to those of S1s ?” Since the discovery of hidden BLR in the archetypical S2 nucleus of NGC 1068 by Antonucci & Miller (1985), it has been considered that S2s are S1s in which the BLR as well as the central engine are hidden from direct view (see, for a review Antonucci 1993). Taking this unified scheme into account, we may expect that there is no systematic difference in the nuclear mass between S1s and S2s. Miller & Goodrich (1990; hereafter MG90) made a systematic study of hidden BLRs of high-polarization S2s and found that the properties of the hidden BLRs studied by polarized broad $H\alpha$ and $H\beta$ emission are nearly the same as those of S1s in the following respects; equivalent widths, line widths, reddening, and luminosities (see also Tran 1995a). The intrinsic $H\beta$ luminosities¹ of the S2s amount to $\sim 10^{43}$ erg s⁻¹. MG90 adopted a typical $H\beta$ luminosity of 10^{43} erg s⁻¹ for S1s and thus reached the conclusion that the intrinsic $H\beta$ luminosities are nearly the same between S1s and S2s. However, the typical $H\beta$ luminosities of S1s are $\sim 10^{41}$ - 10^{42} erg s⁻¹ (Yee 1980; Blumenthal, Keel, & Miller 1982; Dahari & De Robertis 1988). Therefore, the intrinsic $H\beta$ luminosities of S2s may be significantly more luminous than those of S1s. However, although this suggests that there is a certain systematic difference between S1s and S2s, it is noted that the intrinsic $H\beta$ luminosities of S2s depend on the estimates of the optical depth for electron scattering, the degree of *true* polarization, and the covering factor of the scatterers (MG90). Thus the comparison of broad $H\beta$ luminosities between S1s and S2s must be made carefully. After MG90, several new spectropolarimetric observations of S2s have been published (e.g., Tran, Miller, & Kay 1992; Antonucci, Hurt, & Miller 1994; Tran 1995a, 1995b). New interpretations on the observed low polarizations have been also presented (Cid Fernandes & Terlevich 1995; Heckman et al. 1995; Tran 1995c; Kishimoto 1996, 1997). Therefore, it is interesting to revisit the comparison between the hidden BLRs in S2s and the ordinary BLRs in S1s and then to estimate the dynamical masses of S2 nuclei.

2. DYNAMICAL MASS OF ACTIVE GALACTIC NUCLEI

¹We adopt a Hubble constant $H_0 = 50$ km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹ and a deceleration parameter $q_0 = 0$ throughout this paper.

2.1. The Dynamical Mass

If we assume that the kinetic energy of the BLR is balanced by the gravitational potential energy, then the dynamical mass of a nucleus, M_{BH} , is given by

$$M_{\text{BH}} = \frac{\bar{v}^2 r}{2G} \simeq \frac{3v^2 r}{2G} \quad (1)$$

where $\bar{v}$ is the mean velocity of the gas ($\bar{v} = \sqrt{3}v = \sqrt{3}\text{FWHM}$ where FWHM is the full width at half maximum), r is the size of BLR, and G is the gravitational constant [e.g., Padovani & Rafanelli (1988; hereafter PR88); Padovani, Burg, & Edelson (1990; PBE90), Koratkar & Gaskell (1991b; KG91)]. Although various kinds of velocity widths are used in the literature, they are related; $\text{FWZI}/2 \simeq \text{HWZI} \simeq \sqrt{3} \text{FWHM}$ where FWZI and HWZI are full and half width at zero intensity, respectively (Wandel & Yahil 1985). It is however noted that either $\text{HWZI}_{\text{blue}}$ or HWZI_{red} is also sometimes used and they are usually different from $\text{HWZI} = \text{FWZI}/2$ (e.g., PR88, PBE90). Since the maximum velocity is achieved at the innermost radius (r_{in}) of BLR, the larger HWZI is usually adopted in the mass estimate.

Although the velocity width can be measured directly from optical spectra, it is difficult to estimate the innermost radius of BLR. Therefore, this is usually estimated from photoionization considerations (e.g., PR88). The ionization parameter, $U = Q(\text{H})/(4\pi r^2 n c)$, gives an innermost radius,

$$r_{\text{in}} = [Q(\text{H})/4\pi c(Un)_{\text{in}}]^{1/2} \quad (2)$$

where $Q(\text{H})$ is the number of ionizing photons, n is the particle density, and c is the light velocity in the vacuum. From both observational and theoretical considerations, PR88 adopted $(Un)_{\text{in}} \simeq 10^{9.3} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ while PBE90 did $(Un)_{\text{in}} \simeq 10^{9.5} \text{ cm}^{-3}$. These give $r_{\text{in}} \simeq 9.2 \times 10^{16} Q(\text{H})_{55}^{1/2} \text{ cm}$ (PR88) while $r_{\text{in}} \simeq 3.2 \times 10^{16} Q(\text{H})_{55}^{1/2} \text{ cm}$ (PBE90) where $Q(\text{H})_{55} = Q(\text{H})/10^{55}$. Since the variability estimated radii have been also taken into account in PBE90, the estimate of $(Un)_{\text{in}}$ by PBE90 is more reliable than that by PR88. KG91 used for the first time the distances of BLRs estimated only by the cross correlation function (CCF) method for ten AGNs to estimate their

nuclear masses (see also Gaskell & Sparke 1986; Gaskell & Peterson 1987). If we compare the common objects in PR88, PBE90, and KG91, we find that the masses derived by KG91 tend to be more massive than those by PR88 and PBE90. The difference in the mass estimates of PR88, PBE90, and KG91 is due to the two different lines and effective radii used in the analyses. One would expect the mass estimate to be independent of the emission lines used in the analyses if the gas was in Keplerian orbits. Because of the proximity of the CIV line to the central massive engine, this gas may not be in circular motion (e.g., Marziani et al. 1996), and the widths of the CIV may not be a true representation of the circular velocity at the CIV distance. Given the uncertainties in the assumed velocity field and the assumed radii, even though the mass estimates from PR88, PBE90, and KG91 seem to differ by a factor of 3, the various methods are mostly consistent.

2.2. The Dynamical Mass of Seyfert 2 Nuclei

Hidden BLRs have been found in nine S2s (MG90; Tran 1995a, 1995b, 1995c). Using observational properties of the hidden BLRs, we estimate nuclear masses of the nine S2s. Here we use the following relation to estimate the dynamical mass,

$$M_{\text{BH}} \approx \frac{(\sqrt{3}\text{FWHM})^2 r}{2G}, \quad (3)$$

Since the broad line emission of $\text{H}\beta$ was used in the previous estimates of M_{BH} for S1s (PR88; PBE90), we also use the *hidden* broad $\text{H}\beta$ emission for the S2s in order to make a consistent comparison of M_{BH} between S1s and S2s. Since our main purpose is to compare the dynamical masses of nuclei between S2s and S1s, the most important point is to use *a unique* dynamical method. Therefore we use equation (3) to estimate all the dynamical masses in this paper. Following PBE90, we use the inner radius of BLR by

$$r \simeq 3.6 \times 10^{16} Q(\text{H})_{54}^{1/2} \text{ cm} \quad (4)$$

where $Q(\text{H})$ is the number of hydrogen ionizing photons [$Q(\text{H})_{54} = Q(\text{H})/10^{54}$]. Theoretically, there is a linear relationship between $Q(\text{H})$ and $L(\text{H}\beta_{\text{b}})$ where $L(\text{H}\beta_{\text{b}})$ is the broad $\text{H}\beta$ luminosity [e.g., $Q(\text{H}) \simeq 2.1 \times 10^{14} L(\text{H}\beta_{\text{b}})$; Peterson 1997]. However, the actual ultraviolet and X-ray observations of S1s give a relation, $Q(\text{H}) \simeq 3.4 \times 10^{14} L(\text{H}\beta_{\text{b}})^{0.95}$ (Padovani 1989; PBE90). Adopting this relation, we estimate the nuclear mass as

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\text{BH}} &\simeq 4.9 \times 10^7 Q(\text{H})_{54}^{1/2} [\sqrt{3} \text{FWHM}(\text{H}\beta_{\text{b}})_{6000}]^2 M_{\odot} \\ &\simeq 9.0 \times 10^6 L(\text{H}\beta_{\text{b}})_{40}^{0.475} [\sqrt{3} \text{FWHM}(\text{H}\beta_{\text{b}})_{6000}]^2 M_{\odot} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\text{FWHM}(\text{H}\beta_{\text{b}})_{6000}$ is the FWHM of the broad $\text{H}\beta$ emission in units of 6000 km s^{-1} and $L(\text{H}\beta_{\text{b}})_{40}$ is the broad $\text{H}\beta$ luminosity in units of $10^{40} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. Given both FWHM and $L(\text{H}\beta_{\text{b}})$, we are able to estimate the dynamical mass of black holes in AGNs.

In order to measure the FWHM of the hidden BLRs, MG90 made a correction for broadening by narrow-line components while Tran (1995a) gave the measured values. There are only three S2s which are both in the MG90 and Tran (1995a) samples. A comparison of these three S2s show that FWHM in two of these objects are nearly similar. From these handful of objects we cannot accurately estimate the effect of the narrow line component on the measured FWHM, and hence we have adopted the FWHM determined by Tran (1995a) except for NGC 1068 for which we use the value determined by MG90. we estimate that the uncertainty in the FWHM is no greater than 50%, which introduces a factor of 2.3 uncertainty in the mass estimates.

In Table 1, we compare the FWHM for three S2s which were measured both by MG90 and by Tran (1995a). Although the FWHM of NGC 7674 in MG90 is remarkably narrower than that in Tran (1995a), those of the remaining S2s are nearly the same. Though it would be desirable to correct for the narrow-line component, the FWHMs of S1s are usually not corrected for this effect. Therefore we adopt the FWHM in Tran (1995a) except for NGC 1068 (MG90). If the narrow line flux would contribute the polarized broad line flux, we may overestimate the black hole mass. However, since it is difficult to estimate this contribution accurately, we use the observed polarized

broad $H\beta$ fluxes given in Tran (1995a) in our analysis.

In order to estimate M_{BH} for S1s, we can use the observed $\text{FWHM}(H\beta_{\text{b}})$ and $L(H\beta_{\text{b}})$ directly. However, when we derive M_{BH} for S2s, the observed polarized, broad $H\beta$ luminosity, $L(H\beta_{\text{b}})_{\text{p}}$, must be converted to the intrinsic one by using the following relation,

$$L(H\beta_{\text{b}})_0 = L(H\beta_{\text{b}})_{\text{p}} \tau_{\text{es}}^{-1} P^{-1} (\Delta\Omega/4\pi)^{-1} \quad (6)$$

where τ_{es} is the optical depth for electron scattering², P is the polarization, and $\Delta\Omega$ is the covering factor of the scatterers in steradian (MG90). It is observed in most cases that the degree of polarization of broad wings of Balmer emission lines is larger than that of nonstellar continuum (e.g., Tran 1995a). This suggests a substantial contribution from a *unpolarized* continuum, which should be corrected for in the estimate of intrinsic polarization (Tran 1995c). Therefore, the degree of polarization used in our analysis is from Table 1 of Tran (1995c) where these corrections have been accounted. The covering factor, $\Delta\Omega/4\pi$, can be estimated using the full opening angle of the narrow line regions, θ_{open} : $\Delta\Omega/4\pi = 1 - \cos(\theta_{\text{open}}/2)$ (MG90).

The average value of θ_{open} of 12 Seyferts studied by Schmitt & Kinney (1996) is $58^\circ \pm 18^\circ$ (see also Pogge 1989; Wilson & Tsvetanov 1994), corresponding to $\Delta\Omega/4\pi \simeq 0.125$ on the average. Although there seems a factor of 2 scatter in the opening angle, this introduces only a factor of 1.4 ($\simeq 2^{0.475}$) uncertainty in the mass estimates. Hence, we adopt $\Delta\Omega/4\pi = 0.1$ for all the objects. Since τ_{es} is usually difficult to estimate, as it depends on electron density, density distribution, etc, therefore, we regard τ_{es} as a free parameter. The effect of τ_{es} will be discussed later.

Finally we summarize the total uncertainty in the dynamical mass estimates. The largest uncertainty comes from the estimate of FWHM. As mentioned before, the uncertainty in the FWHM introduces a factor of 2.3 uncertainty in the mass estimate. Since this uncertainty is due to the correction for the narrow line component, this results in overestimates of the mass.

²The numerical factor due to optical depth is $(1 - e^{-\tau_{\text{es}}})$ and thus equation (6) is valid for $\tau_{\text{es}} \ll 1$. However, since the factor $(1 - e^{-\tau_{\text{es}}}) \simeq 0.63$ for $\tau_{\text{es}} = 1$, we use equation (5) approximately for $\tau_{\text{es}} \lesssim 1$.

Other uncertainty comes from both the estimates of $Q(H^0)$ and $\Delta\Omega/4\pi$. Though the uncertainty in $Q(H^0)$ can be as large as a factor of 3 because of the various assumptions used in calculating this parameter, this uncertainty introduces a factor of 1.7 uncertainty in the mass estimate. The uncertainty in $\Delta\Omega/4\pi$ also introduces a factor of 1.4 uncertainty. Thus there is a factor of 5.5 uncertainty in total in the dynamical mass estimate.

2.3. Results

In Table 2, we present our results. We obtain an average nuclear mass, $\log(M_{\text{BH}}/M_{\odot}) \simeq 8.00 \pm 0.51 - 0.475\log(\tau_{\text{es}}/1)$. If $\tau_{\text{es}} = 0.1$, $\log(M_{\text{BH}}/M_{\odot}) \simeq 8.47 \pm 0.51$. We compare our results with those for S1s studied by PR88 and PBE90. In both PR88 and PBE90, they used either $\text{HWZI}_{\text{blue}}$ or HWZI_{red} . In order to make consistent comparisons of our results with theirs, we evaluate nuclear masses of their S1s using the same method as that of our analysis [equation (5)]. Since the FWZI is given for 30 S1s in PR88 and 25 S1s in PBE90, we can estimate nuclear masses only for these objects, where in equation (5) we use $\text{FWZI}/2$ instead of $\sqrt{3}\text{FWHM}$. The average masses are compared in Table 3. The frequency distributions of $\log(M_{\text{BH}}/M_{\odot})$ are compared in Fig. 1. We also compare the $M_{\text{BH}} - L(\text{H}\beta_{\text{b}})$ relation between S1s and S2s for the two cases; $\tau_{\text{es}} = 0.1$ and $\tau_{\text{es}} = 0.1$ in Fig. 2. The relation for S2s follows nearly the same relation for S1s for both cases. However, if $\tau_{\text{es}} = 0.1$, the S2s tend to be more luminous and more massive than the S1s.

We examine the similarity of the frequency distribution of masses between S2s and S1s shown in Fig. 1. We now adopt the null hypothesis that the S1 and S2 masses come from the same underlying distribution. Applying Kormogrov-Smirnov statistical test, we obtain the probability of randomly selecting the masses from the same underlying distribution is; (1) 27.3% for S2s($\tau_{\text{es}} = 1$) vs. S1s(PR88), (2) 98.2% for S2s($\tau_{\text{es}} = 1$) vs. S1s(PBE90), (3) 0.26% for S2s($\tau_{\text{es}} = 0.1$) vs. S1s(PR88), and (4) 10.7% for S2s($\tau_{\text{es}} = 0.1$) vs. S1s(PBE90). All but the third case show that the dynamical masses of S2s are similar to those of S1s. Given the uncertainty in the dynamical mass estimate (a factor of 5.5), we cannot conclude that the S2s have more massive nuclei than the S1s

even for the third case. However, we should keep in mind that the S2 masses tend to be more massive with decreasing τ . Since low optical depths have been often adopted in previous works, it will become important to estimate τ_{es} accurately for many S2s.

Since our S2 sample is taken from the literature which presents the spectropolarimetry, the S2s studied here maybe biased to show higher polarizations. However, a comparison of the apparent and absolute magnitudes of S2s with (7 objects) and without (42 objects) hidden BLRs show that there is no significant difference between the two samples. Hence it is unlikely that the S2s with polarized $\text{H}\beta$ are intrinsically more luminous and therefore more massive. This seems reasonable because the polarization depends solely on the physical conditions of electron scattering regions as well as on the viewing angle toward them. Further, the three samples compared here have the similar average redshifts; $z = 0.028 \pm 0.019$ for the S2s, 0.036 ± 0.022 for the S1s (PR88), and 0.024 ± 0.017 for the S1s (PBE90). Therefore, it is not expected that there are strong observational biases in the three samples although our samples are not *complete* ones in any sense except for the CfA sample studied by PBE90 (see Huchra & Burg 1992).

3. DISCUSSION

We have derived the dynamical masses of S2 nuclei. Comparing them with those of S1s, we have obtained that the nuclear masses of S2s are similar to those of S1s provided that $\tau_{\text{es}} \sim 1$ while more massive if $\tau_{\text{es}} \ll 1$. For example, if $\tau_{\text{es}} \sim 0.1$, the nuclear masses of S2s would be systematically larger by an order of magnitude than those of S1s. We now consider physical conditions in the electron scattering regions, and we discuss some implications for the unified model of Seyfert nuclei.

Low optical depths have been adopted in previous works based on spectropolarimetry of S2s; e.g., $\tau_{\text{es}} \simeq 0.05 - 0.1$ (Antonucci & Miller 1985; MG90; Miller et al. 1991). As discussed by MG90, if $\tau_{\text{es}} \ll 1$, we would observe many AGN with polarizations higher than 50% provided that the half opening angle of the ionization cone $\theta_c = \theta_{\text{open}}/2 \sim 30^\circ$ as is observed for many S2s (Pogge 1989;

Wilson & Tsvetanov 1994; Schmitt & Kinney 1996). However, the highest polarization observed so far is 16% (NGC 1068: MG90; Antonucci et al. 1994) and the typical polarization is only several percent for the other S2s (MG90; Tran 1995a). The observed polarization is lower than expected, even after the effect of dilution due to the unpolarized continuum radiation is taken into account (Cid Fernandes & Terlevich 1995; Heckman et al 1995; Tran 1995c; Tran, Cohen & Goodrich 1995; see also Kishimoto 1996). Therefore, the optical thick condition cannot be ruled out entirely at present.

We now discuss the physical characteristics of the electron scattering region. The optical depth for electron scattering is estimated by

$$\tau_{\text{es}} \sim \sigma_{\text{T}} \bar{n}_{\text{e}} l_{\text{eff}} \sim \sigma_{\text{T}} N_{\text{e}} \quad (7)$$

where σ_{T} is the Thomson cross section, $0.66 \times 10^{-24} \text{ cm}^2$, $\bar{n}_{\text{e}}$ is the average electron density in the scattering region, l_{eff} is the effective path length, and N_{e} is the electron column density. We obtain $N_{\text{e}} \sim 10^{24} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ for $\tau_{\text{es}} \sim 1$ while $N_{\text{e}} \sim 10^{23} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ for $\tau_{\text{es}} \sim 0.1$. If the kinetic temperature of free electrons is as high as $\sim 10^6 \text{ K}$, significant line broadening would occur due to the scattering (Antonucci & Miller 1985; MG90). Since $v \sim 2000(T_{\text{e}}/10^5 \text{ K}) \text{ km s}^{-1}$, it seems reasonable to assume $T_{\text{e}} \sim 10^5 \text{ K}$ at most (see also Miller et al. 1991).

If the gas in the electron scattering region is in pressure equilibrium with the BLR gas ($n_{\text{e}} \sim 10^9 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ and $T_{\text{e}} \sim 10^4 \text{ K}$; Osterbrock 1989), then the average electron density in the scattering region is $\bar{n}_{\text{e}} \sim 10^8 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, and the effective path lengths are $\sim 10^{16} \text{ cm}$ and $\sim 10^{15} \text{ cm}$ for $\tau_{\text{es}} \sim 1$ and ~ 0.1 , respectively. Since we observe the BLR through the scatterers, the scattering regions are located outside the BLRs and thus the radial distance of scatterers is $r_{\text{e}} > 10^{16} \text{ cm}$. In the case of NGC 1068, it is observed that the scattering regions are extended to $\sim 100 \text{ pc}$ from the nucleus (Capetti et al. 1995a, 1995b). This large value was indeed suspected from the photoionization consideration by Miller et al. (1991). It is therefore considered that the electron scattering regions are located at $r_{\text{e}} \sim 10^{16} - 10^{20} \text{ cm}$. The effective radius of scatterers may be different from object to object because it depends also on how we observe the dusty tori in AGNs

(i.e., viewing angle dependent; cf. MG90, Miller et al. 1991; Kishimoto 1996, 1997).

It is worth noting that the above physical conditions are quite similar to those of warm absorbers probed by X-ray spectroscopy of type 1 AGNs (Halpern 1984; Netzer 1993; Nandra & Pounds 1992, 1994; Ptak et al. 1994; Reynolds & Fabian 1995; Reynolds et al. 1995; Otani et al. 1996; Reynolds 1997). However, the electron column density inferred in this study, $N_e \sim 10^{23} - 10^{24} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, is higher by one to two orders of magnitude than those of warm absorbers, $\sim 10^{22} \text{ cm}^{-2}$. This seems to be inconsistent with the strict unified model of Seyfert nuclei (Antonucci & Miller 1985). We may, however, consider the higher column densities in the S2s as due to the effect of multiple scattering if $\tau_{\text{es}} \sim 1$. Another interpretation may be that S2s are gas-richer systematically than S1s (cf. Heckman et al. 1989; Taniguchi 1997).

We would like to thank Makoto Kishimoto, Youichi Ohyama, and Takashi Murayama for useful discussion. We also thank the anonymous referee for his/her many useful comments and suggestions which improved this paper significantly. This work was financially supported in part by Grant-in-Aids for the Scientific Research (No. 07044054) of the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, and Science.

Table 1: Comparison of the FWHM(H β)^a between MG90 and Tran(1995a)

Galaxy	MG90	Tran (1995a)
Mrk 3	5400	6000 $\pm$ 500
Mrk 463E	3000	2770 $\pm$ 180
NGC 7674	1500	2830 $\pm$ 150

^aIn units of km s⁻¹.

Table 2: The dynamical masses of Seyfert 2 nuclei

Object	FWHM($H\beta_b$) (km s ⁻¹)	$L(H\beta_b)_p^a$ (erg s ⁻¹)	P^b (%)	$M_{BH}(\tau_{es} = 1)$ ($M_\odot$)	$M_{BH}(\tau_{es} = 0.1)$ ($M_\odot$)	Ref. ^c
NGC 1068	3030	1.11×10^{39}	16	1.73×10^7	5.16×10^7	1, 2
NGC 7212	5420	3.40×10^{39}	22	8.09×10^7	2.42×10^8	2
NGC 7674	2830	5.36×10^{39}	8	4.43×10^7	1.32×10^8	2
Mrk 3	6000	1.00×10^{40}	20	1.73×10^8	5.17×10^8	2
Mrk 348	9350	2.95×10^{39}	35 ^d	1.81×10^8	5.39×10^8	2
Mrk 463E	2770	3.99×10^{40}	10	9.89×10^7	2.95×10^8	2
Mrk 477	4130	7.85×10^{40}	2	6.66×10^8	1.96×10^9	2
Mrk 1210	3080	2.22×10^{39}	15	2.56×10^7	7.63×10^8	2
Was 49	5860	3.30×10^{40}	20	2.91×10^8	8.69×10^8	2

^aLuminosity of polarized, broad $H\beta$ emission.

^bIntrinsic polarization corrected for the unpolarized continuum emission as well as interstellar polarization taken from Tran (1995c).

^c1. Miller & Goodrich 1990; 2. Tran 1995a, 1995c.

^dThe intrinsic polarization for $H\alpha$ emission.

Table 3: Comparison of the average dynamical masses between S2s and S1s

Sample	Number	M_{BH} ($M_{\odot}$)
S2 ($\tau_{\text{es}} = 1$)	9	8.00 ± 0.51
S2 ($\tau_{\text{es}} = 0.1$)	9	8.47 ± 0.51
S1 (PR88)	30	7.89 ± 0.57
S1 (PBE90)	25	7.48 ± 0.63

REFERENCES

- Antonucci, R. 1993, *ARA&A*, 31, 473
- Antonucci, R., Hurt, T., & Miller, J. 1994, *ApJ*, 430, 210
- Antonucci, R., & Miller, J. S. 1985, *ApJ*, 297, 621
- Blandford, R. D. 1990, in *Active Galactic Nuclei*, ed. R. D. Blandford, H. Netzer, L. Woltier (Springer-Verlag), 161
- Blandford, R. D., & McKee, C. F. 1982, *ApJ*, 255, 419
- Blumenthal, G. R., Keel, W. C., & Miller, J. S. 1982, *ApJ*, 257, 499
- Capetti, A., Axon, D. J., Macchetto, F., Sparks, W. B., & Boksenberg, A. 1995a, *ApJ*, 446, 155
- Capetti, A., Macchetto, F., Axon, D. J., Sparks, W. B., & Boksenberg, A. 1995b, *ApJ*, 452, L87
- Cid Fernandes, R. Jr., & Terlevich, R. 1995, *MNRAS*, 272, 423
- Clavel, J., et al. 1991, *ApJ*, 336, 64
- Dahari, O. V., & De Robertis, M. M. 1988, *ApJS*, 67, 249
- de Vaucouleurs, G., de Vaucouleurs, A., Corwin, H. G., Jr., Buta, R. J., Paturel, G., & Forqué, P. 1991, *Third Reference Catalogue of Bright Galaxies* (Springer-Verlag)
- Dibai, E. A. 1981, *Soviet Astr.*, 24, 389
- Dibai, E. A. 1984, *Soviet Astr.*, 28, 245
- Gaskell, C. M. 1988, *ApJ*, 325, 114
- Gaskell, C. M., & Peterson, B. M. 1987, *ApJS*, 65, 1
- Gaskell, C. M., & Sparke, L. S. 1986, *ApJ*, 305, 175
- Haehnelt, M. G., & Rees, M. J. 1993, *MNRAS*, 263, 168
- Halpern, J. P. 1984, *ApJ*, 281, 90
- Heckman, T. M., Beckwith, S., Blitz, L., Skrutskie, M., & Wilson, A. S. 1989, *ApJ*, 342, 735

- Heckman, T. M., et al. 1995, *ApJ*, 453, 549
- Heisler, C. A., & Vader, J. P. 1994, *AJ*, 107, 35
- Huchra, J., & Burg, R. 1992, *ApJ*, 393, 90
- Joly, M., Collin-Souffrin, S., Masnou, J. L., & Nottale, L. 1985, *A&A*, 152, 282
- Kay, L. E. 1994, *APJ*, 430, 196
- Kishimoto, M. 1996, *ApJ*, 468, 606
- Kishimoto, M. 1997, *ApSS*, 248, 277
- Koratkar, A. P. & Gaskell, C. M. 1991a, *ApJS*, 75, 719
- Koratkar, A. P. & Gaskell, C. M. 1991b, *ApJ*, 370, L61 (KG91)
- Koratkar, A. P. & Gaskell, C. M. 1991c, *ApJ*, 375, 85
- Korista, K. T., et al. 1995, *ApJS*, 97, 285
- Marziani, P., Sulentic, J. W., Dultzin-Hacyan, D., Calvani, M., & Moles, M. 1996, *ApJS*, 104, 37
- Miller, J. S., & Goodrich, R. W. 1990, *ApJ*, 355, 456 (MG90)
- Miller, J. S., Goodrich, R. W., & Mathews, W. G. 1991, *ApJ*, 378, 47
- Nandra, K., & Pounds, K. 1994, *Nature*, 359, 215
- Nandra, K., & Pounds, K. 1994, *MNRAS*, 268, 405
- Nelson, C. H., & Whittle, M. 1995, *ApJS*, 99, 67
- Netzer, H. 1993, *ApJ*, 411, 594
- Osterbrock, D. E. 1989, *Astrophysics of Gaseous Nebulae and Active Galactic Nuclei* (University Science Book)
- Otani, C., et al. 1996, *PASJ*, 48, 211
- Padovani, P. 1989, 209, 27
- Padovani, P., Burg, R., & Edelson, R. A. 1990, *ApJ*, 353, 438 (PBE90)

- Padovani, P., & Rafanelli, P. 1988, *A&A*, 205, 53 (PR88)
- Peterson, B. M. 1993, *PASP*, 105, 247
- Peterson, B. M. 1997, *An Introduction to Active Galactic Nuclei* (Cambridge University Press), 117
- Pier, E., & Krolik, J. 1993, *ApJ*, 418, 673
- Pogge, R. W., 1989, *ApJ*, 345, 730
- Ptak, A., Yaqoob, T., Serlemitsos, P., & Mushotzky, R. 1994, *ApJ*, 436, L31
- Rees, M. J. 1984, *ARA & A*, 22, 471
- Reshetnikov, V. P. 1987, *Astrofizika*, 27, 283
- Reynolds, C. S. 1997, *MNRAS*, 286, 513
- Reynolds, C. S., & Fabian, A. C. 1995, *MNRAS*, 273, 1167
- Reynolds, C. S., Fabian, A. C., Nandra, K., Inoue, H., Kunieda, H., & Iwasawa, K. 1995, *MNRAS*, 277, 901
- Robinson, A. 1994, in *ASP Conf. Ser. 69, Reverberation Mapping of the Broad-Line Region of Active Galactic Nuclei*, ed. P. M. Gondhalekar, K. Horne, & B. M. Peterson (San Francisco: ASP), 147
- Salzer, J. J., Moody, J. W., Rosenberg, J. L., Gregory, S. A., & Newberry, M. V. 1995, *AJ*, 109, 2376
- Sandage, A., & Tammann, G. A. 1981, *A Revised Shapley-Ames Catalog of Bright Galaxies* (CARNEGIE INSTITUTION OF WASHINGTON)
- Schmitt, H. R., & Kinney, A. L. 1996, *ApJ*, 463, 498
- Setti, G., & Woltier, L. 1966, *ApJ*, 144, 838
- Taniguchi, Y. 1997, *ApJ*, 487, L17
- Tran, H. D. 1995a, *ApJ*, 440, 565

- Tran, H. D. 1995b, ApJ, 440, 578
- Tran, H. D. 1995c, ApJ, 440, 597
- Tran, H. D., Cohen, M. H., & Goodrich, R. W. 1995, AJ, 110, 2597
- Tran, H. D., Miller, J. S., & Kay, L. E. 1992, ApJ, 397, 452
- Wandel, A., & Mushotzky, R. F. 1986, ApJ, 306, L61
- Wandel, A., & Yahil, A. 1985, ApJ, 295, L1
- Wanders, I., et al. 1995, ApJ, 453, L87
- Wanders, I., & Peterson, B. M. 1996, ApJ, 466, 174
- Wanders, I., & Peterson, B. M. 1997, ApJ, 477, 990
- Wilson, A. S., & Tsvetanov, Z. I. 1994, AJ, 107, 1227
- Woltier, L. 1959, ApJ, 130, 38
- Yee, H. K. C. 1980, ApJ, 241, 894

Fig. 1.— Frequency distributions of black hole masses ($M_{\text{BH}}/M_{\odot}$) for the S2s studied here, S1s studied by both PR88 and PBE90. As for the S2s, we show the results for $\tau_{\text{es}} = 1$ and $\tau_{\text{es}} = 0.1$ separately.

Fig. 2.— The $M_{\text{BH}} - L_{\text{H}\beta_{\text{b}}}$ relation is compared between S1s and S2. The left panel shows the case of $\tau_{\text{es}} = 1$ for S2s while the right panel shows the case of $\tau_{\text{es}} = 0.1$. The straight lines show the regression line for the S1 data (PR88 and PBE90).



